



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,502	02/15/2002	Said M. Sebt	15101.01902	7653

7590 06/04/2004

JEFF LLOYD
2421 N.W. 41ST STREET
SUITE A-1
GAINESVILLE,, FL 32606-6669

EXAMINER

MARVICH, MARIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1636

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/049,502

Applicant(s)

SEBTI, SAID M.

Examiner

Maria B Marvich, PhD

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 4/22/2004.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Upon reconsideration, the restriction requirement mailed 2/25/04 has been withdrawn and replaced with the following. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372:

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-5, 7-12 and 16 drawn to a method comprising contacting the interior of a cell with RhoB protein.

Group II, claim 6 drawn to a therapeutic composition comprising RhoB or a variant thereof.

Group IV, claims 13-15 drawn to a nucleic acid construct comprising a region encoding an amino acid substantially similar to RhoB and a sequence directing the prenylation of RhoB.

PCT Rule 13.2 requires that unity of invention exists only when the shared same or corresponding technical feature is a contribution over the prior art. The inventions listed as Group I-III do not relate to a single general inventive concept because they lack the same or corresponding technical feature. The “special technical feature” of Group I is

Art Unit: 1636

contacting the interior of a cell with an effective amount of a RhoB protein, which is shown by Chen et al (Journal of Biological Chemistry, 2000, Vol 275(24) pp 17974-17978 see e.g. page 17976 col 1, first paragraph), to lack novelty of inventive step and does not make a contribution over the prior art. The ‘special technical feature’ of Group II is a therapeutic composition of RhoB, which is shown by Liu and Jessell (Development, 1998, Vol 125, pages 5055-5067 see e.g. page 5056, column 2, paragraph 5) to lack novelty of inventive step and does not make a contribution over the prior art. The “special technical feature of Group III is a nucleic acid construct comprising a region encoding an amino acid substantially similar to RhoB and a sequence directing prenylation of RhoB, which is shown by Lebowitz et al (Journal of Biological Chemistry, 1997, Vol 272(25) pp 15591-15594 see e.g. page 15591, col 1, paragraph 5) to lack novelty of inventive step and does not make a contribution over the prior art.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provision of MPEP 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable produce will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendment submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirements for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims

Art Unit: 1636

will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 USC 101, 101, 103 and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claim in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 USC 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 USC 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon cancellation of claims to a non-elected inventions, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 1636

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria B Marvich, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-0774. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel, PhD can be reached on (571)-272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maria B Marvich, PhD
Examiner
Art Unit 1636

May 14, 2004


GERY LEFFERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER